DEWAN'S REPLY: Captain Shore, you have heard what I said a little while ago in my reply to Mr. Wright's representation. I shall be glad if you will supply me, confidentially if you like, with the results of the analysis that have been made in regard to adulterated tea.

20. Amendment of the Rubber Thefts Prevention Regulation, IX of 1087, on the lines suggested at the 24th session of the Assembly.

CAPTAIN M. F. SHORE (*Member, South Travancore Planters' Association*) said that at the 24th session of the Assembly, he had requested Government to make certain amendments to the Rubber Thefts Prevention Regulation, IX of 1087. The amendments proposed were :—

(1) The following clause should be added to Section (4), subsection (1): - "That licences may be granted only on deposit of Rs. 1,000 and that the names of such licence holders may, from time to time, be pubished in the Government Gazette." Section 4 would then read: "The Peishkar or other officer in charge of the Revenue Division may issue free of charge licences under his hand authorising the person to whom the same are granted to deal in rubber, that licences may be granted only on deposit of Rs. 1,000 and that the names of such licence holders may, from time to time, be published in the Government Gazette."

(2) The clause "In perpetuity and his deposit of Rs. 1,000 forfeited" should be added to Section 115, clause (3), which would read as "any person who is found guilty of any offence under this Regulation shall be liable to have his licence cancelled in perpetuity and his deposit of Rs. 1,000 forfeited."

(3) The clause "Or one member of the local planters' association nominated annually by Government to inspect in conjunction with either of the above" should be added to Section 10 which would read as "It shall be lawful for any Magistrate or for any police officer not below the rank of an Inspector or any person authorised in writing by the Peishkar or other officer in charge of the revenue Division or one member of the local planters' association nominated annually by Government to inspect, in conjunction with either of the above, licenced premises, to enter any licenced premises at any time between sun rise and sun set and to call for, inspect, and take extracts from any book required to be kept by this Regulation etc., etc."

With reference to these proposals, the member requested Government to state if they intended appointing Honorary Magistrates in the rubber-growing districts in order to assist the police to take active part in the suppression of rubber thefts.

DEWAN'S REPLY : Captain Shore, I, see you made representations on the same subject in the last Assembly. Well, those representations and your suggested amendments were forwarded to the Commissioner of the Devicolam Division, and the Land Revenue Commissioner for comment and advice. I am still awaiting reports from these officers. I shall take steps to have their replies expedited, and I shall go into this question fully.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

There is one point however on which I shall speak now. You suggest that there should be honorary magistrates to make investigations under the Rubber Thefts Prevention Regulation. The appointment of honorary magistrates is possible only under the Criminal Procedure Code. If they are appointed—I am having the question under consideration—they will only be able to act in accordance with the powers laid down in the Criminal Procedure Code, and that does not include investigations under the Rubber Thefts Prevention Regulation. If that is also to be brought within the purview of these honorary magistrates, I think it will be necessary to make a consequential amendment. That point will be examined and I hope to have a communication addressed to you on the subject before very long.

21. Jenmies and tenants.

MR. DEVAN PARAMESWARAN VALIYATHAN (*Member, Kottarakara taluk*) said that the public were at a loss to see the need for the round table conference which Government proposed to held in regard to the Jenmi-Kudiyan Regulation Amendment bill. If the bill was read in the Council, it would go to the Select Committee and Government could, if they chose, nominate additional members in the committee. Similarly when, after the Select Committee's report, the bill was again read in the Council, Government could nominate additional members there also. Government could also acquaint themselves with the trend of public opinion on either side and they were fully competent either before the bill was settled or after that to add to or modify its provisions. As such the Kudiyans were inclined to suspect whether the conference was not a means for blocking the progress of the bill. Their suspicions gained strength from the fact that Government had done nothing for the election of the two jenmi members of the conference even though two months had elapsed since they promised to arrange for the election.

It was clear as much to Government as to the tenants that the new bill was not calculated to secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number. What Government should therefore do was to acquire all *jenmom* lands after paying proper compensation to the *jenmies* and then register the lands to the tenants on *pandarapattom* tenure. It was the first duty of Government to introduce into the Council a bill with this end in view and thereby render the present bill unnecessary.

If the Government were not prepared to take such a step, it was their duty to render all assistance to the tenants for introducing and passing a bill after their own heart. There were many big foreign *jenmies* in the members' constituency, namely, the Kottarakara taluk. There were also a few small native *jenmies*. But not less than 30 per cent of the population were tenants and their relations or dependants. The majority of cases in the local Munsiff's Court were between these *jenmies* and tenants. The same thing held good in other taluks as well. The relation between *jenmies* and tenants contributed to this

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly